



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

IFW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,622	03/29/2004	Hung-Yu Li	3226/23	9844

7590 04/06/2005

DENNISON, SCHULTZ & DOUGHERTY  
612 Crystal Square 4  
1745 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, VA 22202-3417

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, JERROLD D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3728

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED  
APR 20 2005  
OPIE/JC/MJS

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/810,622	LI, HUNG-YU
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jerrold Johnson	3728	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2004.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.  
\_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4,5,6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 “the aperture” is confusing, as there have previously been claimed a “plurality of rows of apertures”. Additionally, the aperture itself should be defined by the structure that forms it, as the aperture itself is the absence of structure. Accordingly, the proper claim language would be the “aperture is defined by a slanted ...” Furthermore, the claim ends abruptly with fluid in a confusing manner. Correction is required.

Claim 5, again “the aperture” as in claim 4, and again, an aperture cannot be upright, the structure which defines it, however, can be upright.

Claim 6, “cones” have not yet been set forth in the claims. Additionally, “flush” would be better served by “flush with each other” as currently there is no explanation in the claims as to with what the apexes are flush.

Claim 7 is confusing. The height of the innermost rows does not increase, as is claimed. The height of the cones increases from the innermost rows to the outermost rows.

**Correction is required.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huxtable US 5,178,353 in view of Gruendl US D83,439, Smith US D186,809, and Benoto US D137,908.

Re claim 1, Huxtable discloses an open first container that is capable of supporting a second container. The first container of Huxtable does not disclose the second container nor a plurality of slits.

Gruendl discloses a soap dish comprising a plurality of parallel slits, so as to allow water to drain through the bottom of the container.

Smith discloses the known use of a second container configured for supporting a bar of soap fitted within a first container.

Benoto discloses a second container capable of being fitted in the first container, the second container including a plurality of rows of tapered projections on a bottom, the rows of projections being adapted to support a soap, and a plurality of rows of apertures each row of apertures being disposed between two adjacent rows of projections, wherein water stored in the second container is adapted to carry off through the rows of apertures by passing the projections, and outside air is adapted to reach the soap via the rows of apertures.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the open first container of Huxtable with parallel slits as taught by Gruendl so as to provide drainage of water from the first container. It further would have been obvious to combine the first container of Huxtable in view of Gruendl with a second container as taught by Smith so as to elevate a bar soap off of the first container and maximize air flow around the bar of soap, as well as to provide the user of the containers with greater ease of cleaning the containers. It further would have been obvious to provide a second container with interspersed rows of projections and apertures as taught by Benoto so as to maximize air flow around the soap bar, as well as for enhanced esthetics.

Re claim 2 and 3, although it is unclear if Smith discloses the first and second containers being integral or separable, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make them in either manner. Making them integral, such as either by adhesive attachment or through a unitary manufacture would minimize the possibility that the second container could fall from the first container or be inadvertently stuck to a soft bar

of soap. Making them separable would enhance the ability to remove the second container for cleaning.

Note MPEP 2144.04 which sets for the PTO examination guidelines on the issues of making separable and making integral. In most situations, such as in the current application, making integral or separable are within the purview of a skilled artisan.

Re claim 5, the apertures of Benoto are upright, or more accurately, the walls defining the apertures are upright.

Re claim 6, the apexes of Benoto are flush with each other.

Re claim 8, note raised pads on the bottom surface on Benoto.

2. Claims 1,2,3,5,6,8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huxtable US 5,178,353 in view of Gruendl US D83,439, Smith US D186,809, and Greenhut et al. US D312,740 and Evans US 3,019,549.

Re claim 1, Huxtable discloses an open first container that is capable of supporting a second container. The first container of Huxtable does not disclose the second container nor a plurality of slits.

Gruendl discloses a soap dish comprising a plurality of parallel slits, so as to allow water to drain through the bottom of the container.

Smith discloses the known use of a second container configured for supporting a bar of soap fitted within a first container.

Greenhut discloses a second container capable of being fitted in the first container, the second container including a plurality of rows of tapered projections on a bottom, the rows of projections being adapted to support a soap, and a plurality of rows of apertures, wherein water stored in the second container is adapted to carry off through the rows of apertures by passing the projections, and outside air is adapted to reach the soap via the rows of apertures.

Greenhut does not disclose that each row of apertures being disposed between two adjacent rows of projections.

Evans discloses each row of apertures being disposed between two adjacent rows of projections.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the open first container of Huxtable with parallel slits as taught by Gruendl so as to provide drainage of water from the first container. It further would have been obvious to combine the first container of Huxtable in view of Gruendl with a second container as taught by Smith so as to elevate a bar of soap off of the first container and maximize air flow around the bar of soap, as well as to provide the user of the containers with greater ease of cleaning the containers. It further would have been obvious to provide a second container with projections and apertures as taught by Greenhut so as to maximize air flow around the soap bar, and to have interspersed rows of projections with rows of apertures as taught by Evans so as to provide enhanced esthetics.

Re claim 2 and 3, although it is unclear if Smith discloses the first and second containers being integral or separable, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make them in either manner. Making them integral, such as either by adhesive attachment or through a unitary manufacture would minimize the possibility that the second container could fall from the first container or be inadvertently stuck to a soft bar of soap. Making them separable would enhance the ability to remove the second container for cleaning.

Note MPEP 2144.04 which sets for the PTO examination guidelines on the issues of making separable and making integral. In most situations, such as in the current application, making integral or separable are within the purview of a skilled artisan.

Re claim 5, the apertures of Greenhut are upright, or more accurately, the walls defining the apertures are upright.

Re claim 6, the apexes of Greenhut are flush with each other.

Re claim 8, note raised pads on the bottom surface on Greenhut (additional projections).

Re claim 9, the projections are cones.

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huxtable US 5,178,353 in view of Gruendl US D83,439, Smith US D186,809, and Greenhut et al. US D312,740 and Evans US 3,019,549, and further in view of White US D193,085.

Huxtable US 5,178,353 in view of Gruendl US D83,439, Smith US D186,809, and Greenhut et al. US D312,740 and Evans US 3,019,549 does not disclose apertures comprising slanted annular top surfaces and lower upright channels, i.e. chamfered apertures.

White discloses slanted annular top surfaces and lower upright channels, i.e. chamfered apertures.

Accordingly, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the soap dish of Huxtable US 5,178,353 in view of Gruendl US D83,439, Smith US D186,809, and Greenhut et al. US D312,740 and Evans US 3,019,549 by providing chamfered apertures to enhance the drainage capability of the second container.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huxtable US 5,178,353 in view of Gruendl US D83,439, Smith US D186,809, and Greenhut et al. US D312,740 and Evans US 3,019,549, and further in view of Ackermann Swiss CH 657,826.

Huxtable US 5,178,353 in view of Gruendl US D83,439, Smith US D186,809, and Greenhut et al. US D312,740 and Evans US 3,019,549 does not disclose the height of the cones increasing from the innermost rows to the outermost rows.

Ackermann, discloses that the height of soap supporting projections increase from an innermost position to an outermost position.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the soap dish of Huxtable US 5,178,353 in view of Gruendl US D83,439, Smith US D186,809, and Greenhut et al. US D312,740 and Evans US 3,019,549 by providing a the second container with a profile where the height of the cones increasing from the innermost rows to the outermost rows. This profile would accommodate the many soap bars which have a curved bottom surface, as is shown in phantom lines by Ackermann in Fig. 2.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reefe US D137,131 discloses projections at the innermost rows being shorter than that in the outermost rows, as well as rows of projections interspersed by apertures.

Welles US D107,889 discloses tapered projections interspersed with apertures.

Dworkin US 4,300,248 discloses a second container disclosed within a first container. The second container includes apertures.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerrold Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-7141. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 to 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571-272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDJ



Mickey Yu  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700

Application/Control Number: 10/810,622  
Art Unit: 3728

Page 11

<b>Notice of References Cited</b>		Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination	
		10/810,622	LI, HUNG-YU	
Examiner		Art Unit		Page 1 of 1
Jerrold Johnson		3728		

**U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-5,178,353	01-1993	Huxtable, Paul S.	248/222.52
	B	US-D312,740	12-1990	Greenhut et al.	D6/536
	C	US-D193,085	06-1962	White	D6/536
	D	US-3,019,549	02-1962	EVANS WALTER E	206/77.1
	E	US-D186,809	12-1959	Smith	D6/533
	F	US-D141,011	04-1945	Madan	D6/536
	G	US-D137,908	05-1944	Benoto	D6/536
	H	US-D107,889	01-1938	Welles	D6/539
	I	US-D137,131	01-1944	Reefe	D6/536
	J	US-D83,439	02-1931	Gruendl	D6/540
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

**FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N	CH 657826 A5	09-1986	Switzerland	ACKERMANN, LUTZ	B65D 81/36
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

**NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

\*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)  
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.



Erfindungspatent für die Schweiz und Liechtenstein  
Schweizerisch-liechtensteinischer Patentschutzvertrag vom 22. Dezember 1978

⑫ PATENTSCHRIFT A5


⑪ Gesuchsnummer:	4925/82
⑫ Anmeldungsdatum:	17.08.1982
⑬ Priorität(en):	13.05.1982 DE U/8213946
⑭ Patent erteilt:	30.09.1986
⑮ Patentschrift veröffentlicht:	30.09.1986

⑯ Inhaber:	"am"-kosmetik GmbH + Co. KG, Frankenthal/Pfalz (DE)
⑰ Erfinder:	Ackermann, Lutz, Frankenthal/Pfalz (DE)
⑱ Vertreter:	A. Braun, Braun, Héritier, Eschmann AG, Patentanwälte, Basel

⑲ Seifenverpackung.

⑳ Die ähnlich einer Zündholzschachtel aufgebaute Seifenverpackung weist eine Hülle (1) aus Karton oder Kunststoff auf, in welche sich ein aus Kunststoff erstellter Schubkasten (2) einschieben lässt. Der Boden (4) des Schubkastens (2) ist mit Löchern (5) versehen und der Form der zu verpackenden Seife (3) angepasst.

Diese Verpackung verhindert das "Sumpfen" sowie das Verrutschen der Seife und eignet sich insbesondere für die Reise.



## PATENTANSPRÜCHE

1. Seifenverpackung, gekennzeichnet durch eine hülsenartige Hülle (1) und einen seitlich in die Hülle (1) einschließbaren wannenartigen Schubkasten (2, 6) aus Kunststoff, der zur Aufnahme der Seite (3) bestimmt ist.
2. Seifenverpackung nach Anspruch 1, dadurch gekennzeichnet, dass der Bodenteil (4) des Schubkastens (2, 6) an die Form der Seife (3) angepasst geformt ist.
3. Seifenverpackung nach Anspruch 1 oder 2, dadurch gekennzeichnet, dass der Bodenteil (4) des Schubkastens (2, 6) Löcher (5) enthält.
4. Seifenverpackung nach Anspruch 2 oder 3, dadurch gekennzeichnet, dass der Bodenteil (4) des Schubkastens (6) Profilsteg (7) aufweist, deren der Seife (3) zugewandter Verlauf deren Form angepasst geformt ist.
5. Seifenverpackung nach einem der Ansprüche 1 bis 4, dadurch gekennzeichnet, dass die Hülle (1) aus Karton besteht.
6. Seifenverpackung nach einem der Ansprüche 1 bis 5, dadurch gekennzeichnet, dass die Hülle (1) nach Art eines Schubers ausgebildet ist.

Die Erfindung betrifft eine Seifenverpackung.

Üblicherweise besteht eine Seifenverpackung aus einem Falzkarton, aus dem nach Öffnen einer eingestckten Klappe die Seife entferbar ist, wobei die Verpackung anschliend weggeworfen wird.

Zur Aufbewahrung von Seifen an Waschbecken dienen Seifenmulden, in denen die Seife an einigen Stellen abgestützt wird, damit das Wasser ablaufen kann, damit die Seife nicht «sumpft».

Auf Reisen werden häufig wannenartige Kästen verwendet, in die die Seife eingelegt wird, wobei dann ein entsprechend angepasst ausgebildeter, ebenfalls kastenartiger Deckel darüber gestülpt wird. In diesem Behälter kann die Seife sumpfen. Darüberhinaus handelt es sich um einen Gegenstand, der zusätzlich zur Seife selbst erstanden werden muss. Selbst wenn in Einzelfällen derartige Behälter zusammen mit der Seife angeboten werden, sind sie zusätzlich in einem Falzkarton aufbewahrt.

Es ist Aufgabe der Erfindung eine Seifenverpackung anzugeben, bei der der wegzuwerfende Anteil aufs Äußerste verringert ist.

Die Aufgabe wird erfahrungsgemäß durch eine hülsenartige Hülle und einen seitlich in die Hülle einschließbaren wannenartigen Schubkasten aus Kunststoff, der zur Aufnahme der Seife bestimmt ist, gelöst.

Vorteilhafterweise ist der Bodenteil des Schubkastens an die Form der Seife angepasst geformt, wodurch eine Beschädigung der Seife beim Transport vermieden und darüberhinaus ein lästiges Klappern verhindert ist.

Von weiterem Vorteil ist, wenn durch Löcher in dem Bodenteil und/oder Profilsteg erreicht ist, dass die Seife schnell abtrocknen kann, also ein Sumpfen der Seife verhindert ist. Somit wird durch die Erfindung eine Seifenverpackung angegeben, die nicht nur als Verkaufsverpackung dient, sondern auch als Behälter für unterwegs geeignet ist und die darüberhinaus in einfacher preiswerter Weise augebildet ist. Für Verkaufszwecke genügt es, die Seifenverpackung insgesamt oder lediglich den Schubkasten mit eingelegter Seife durch eine Klarsichtfolie zu umgeben.

Die Erfindung wird anhand der in der Zeichnung dargestellten Ausführungsbeispiele näher erläutert. Es zeigen:

Fig. 1 die Seifenverpackung ohne Seife, bei der der Schubkasten aus der Hülle herausgezogen ist,

Fig. 2 den Schnitt II-II in Fig. 1 bei in die Hülle eingeschobenem Schubkasten,

Fig. 3 schematisch eine Ausführungsform des Schubkastens mit Profilstegen.

5. Die in Fig. 1 dargestellte Seifenverpackung ist ähnlich einer Zündholzschachtel durch einerseits eine Hülle 1, vorzugsweise aus Karton, und andererseits einen Schubkasten 2 aus Kunststoff gebildet. Die Hülle kann selbstverständlich ebenfalls aus Kunststoff bestehen.

10. Die Hülle 1 ist, falls sie aus Karton besteht, aus einem rechteckförmigen Zuschnitt um Falzungen gefaltet gebildet, wobei sich zwei Endabschnitte überlappen und die überlappenden Bereiche miteinander verklebt oder in anderer Weise miteinander verbunden sind, wie das beispielsweise bei 15. Zündholzschachteln üblich ist. Wenn die Hülle 1 aus Kunststoff besteht, kann sie einstückig geformt sein. Die Hülle 1 kann Aufkleber oder Aufdrucke zur Präsentation der Ware, nämlich der eingelegten Seife, enthalten.

Der Schubkasten 2 besteht im Wesentlichen aus Seitenwänden 8, 9, Stirnwänden 10, 11 und einem Bodenteil 4. Vorzugsweise weist der Bodenteil 4 über dem gesamten Flächenbereich verteilte Löcher 5 auf. Wie sich das aus Fig. 2 ergibt, sind die Abmessungen der Stirnwände 10, 11 und der Seitenwände 8, 9 so, dass der Schubkasten 2 im Wesentlichen bündig in die Hülle 1 eingeschoben werden kann. Der Bodenteil 4 ist bevorzugt an die Form der Seife 3 angepasst verformt. Dadurch ist ein Verrutschen der (fabrikneuen) Seife in der Seifenverpackung aus Hülle 1 und Schubkasten 2 sicher verhindert, wie das in Fig. 2 dargestellt ist. Im Gebrauch wird der Schubkasten 2 wie bei einer Zündholzschachtel aus der Hülle 1 seitlich herausgeschoben, woraufhin die Seife 3 zugänglich ist.

Sie kann nach Gebrauch wieder in die durch den geformten Bodenteil 4 gebildete Mulde zurückgelegt werden. Durch die Löcher 5 im Bodenteil 4 kann das Wasser abfließen, wodurch die Seife 3 trocken wird und ein Sumpfen der Seife 3 sicher vermieden ist. Anschliend kann der Schubkasten 2 mit der (trockengewordenen) Seife wieder in die Hülle 1 zurückgeschoben werden. Die Seifenverpackung kann wieder verwendet werden. D. h. also, dass die erfahrungsgemäß Seifenverpackung nicht nur zur Verkaufspräsentation geeignet ist, sondern auch beispielsweise auf Reisen als Reisebehälter verwendet werden kann. Das Mitnehmen zusätzlicher Reisebehälter ist somit entbehrlich. Auch bei ständigem Gebrauch im Haushalt ist eine Verschmutzung der am Waschbecken vorgesehenen Mulde weitestgehend vermieden.

Zur Erleichterung der Handhabung der Seife 3, d. h. damit diese leichter aus dem Schubkasten 2 herausgenommen werden kann, können die Seitenwände 8 und 9, wie das in Fig. 1 und Fig. 2 dargestellt ist, seitliche Eingriffs-Ausnehmungen 12 aufweisen.

Insbesondere für Reisezwecke kann es vorteilhaft sein, wenn die Hülle 1 der Seifenverpackung nach Art eines Schubers ausgebildet ist, d. h. lediglich eine Einschuböffnung 13 aufweist und das dieser gegenüberliegende Ende der Hülle 1 verschlossen ist, wie durch eine Wand 14, wie das in Fig. 2 in Strichpunktlinien dargestellt ist.

Gemäß einer anderen Ausführungsform ist der Bodenteil 4 des Schubkastens 6 durch Profilsteg 7 gebildet, die wie bei dem Ausführungsbeispiel gemäß Fig. 1 einen der Seife 3 zugewandten Verlauf besitzen, der deren Form angepasst ist. Wenngleich auch bei diesem Ausführungsbeispiel Löcher, wie die Löcher 5 vorgesehen sein können, so ist dies nicht zwingend. Falls keine derartigen Löcher vorgesehen sind, muss vor dem Wiedereinschieben des Schubkastens 6 in die Hülle 1 lediglich die getrocknete Seife noch einmal herausgehoben und das abgelaufene Wasser ausgegossen werden.

3

657 826

Beiden Ausführungsformen der Erfindung ist gemeinsam, dass der Schubkasten 2 bzw. 6 nicht nur als Verpackung für die Verkaufsrepräsentation verwendet werden

kann, sondern darüberhinaus auch als Behälter für die Seife auf Reisen verwendet werden kann.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

55

60

65

657 826

1 Blatt




FIG. 1




FIG. 2




FIG. 3


Organization 44-163700 RANDOLPH  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER



RECEIVED  
APR 14 2005

USPTO MAIL CENTER



BEST AVAILABLE COPY